

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action of September 5, 2008. With this response, claims 9 and 21 are amended, new claim 28 is added and claims 1-8 and 18-20 are canceled, claims 9-17 and 21-28 are presented reconsideration and favorable action.

In the Office Action, Figure 1A was objected to. With this response, a new Figure 1A is submitted and it is believed that the rejection may be withdrawn. With this amendment, element 110 includes lines pointing to additional “rectangles.”

In the Office Action, the title of the invention was objected to. The title has been amended and it is believed that the objection may be withdrawn.

Independent claim 21 was rejected based upon Wilk et al. (US 6,643,124). However it is believed that the amended claim 21 is patentably distinct from this reference. Independent claim 21 states that a first display edge is in abutting contact with a second display edge. As illustrated in, for example, Figure 1A, this allows the two display portions (2,4) to abut one another and form a continuous display surface. The connection joint portion is then positioned along a top side of the display (a top display edge) and a bottom display edge which are spaced apart by the first and second display edges which are in abutting contact.

In contrast, the displays shown in Wilk are spaced apart by a frame. This results in two individual displays which cannot be operated as a single continuous/contiguous display. It is believed that the rejection against claims 21-27 should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based upon Wilk in view of Tsugane et al. (US 5,657,370). However, it is believed that amended independent claim 9 is patentably distinct from these references.

In the configuration shown in Tsugane et al., the “key input part” would slide on top of any display portion and thereby prevent the display portion from being viewed when the key input is slid into the “panel housing”. In contrast, as set forth in independent claim 9, the key input part is positioned behind the displays and does not cover the displays when inserted into the lower portion of the panel housing. This allows the displays to be viewed even when the key input part is slid into the panel housing. As this configuration is not shown by Wilk and Tsugane

et al., it is believed that the rejection against claim 9, along with its dependent claims, should be withdrawn.

Additionally, new dependent claim 28 describes the arrangement of the display edges in abutting contact along the connection joint. This also is not shown by the combination of Tsugane and Wilk.

It is believed that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Consideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment, including the Office Action's characterizations of the art, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute the rejection claims in further prosecution of this or related applications.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /Judson K. Champlin/
Judson K. Champlin, Reg. No. 34,797
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312